

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

11259

number of cost studies and reports and believe, contrary to what the Defense Department contends, that the facts show such work can be done more economically in the private than in the Navy yards.

Beyond the question of economy is the need from a defense standpoint to maintain the skills and facilities in both private and public yards. The reason for the dispute, in my opinion, is the low level of new construction and modernization activity in both the naval and merchant vessel categories—a trend which results in a continuing and progressive deterioration of our strength on the ocean vis-a-vis our principal protagonist, Soviet Russia.

Ocean tonnage is and will continue to be vital to our national defense for a long time to come. There is enough work that needs to be done to keep all of our yards—naval and private—busy. If this is done an arbitrary split becomes unnecessary.

I am told that the Navy's plans and projections for fiscal 1966 are such that the dollar volume of work allocated to private yards will be approximately the same during 1966. I certainly hope so and shall watch with interest. I hope that at least the equivalent volume can be placed on competitive private bids in 1966 and subsequent years. If not, the private shipyards in Oregon and their employees will be out of business and out of work.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIENHUA INCIDENT

(Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I should like to make the following statement in keeping with the promise of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, today the House Armed Services Committee received a secret briefing by Lieutenant General Martin, the Inspector General of the Air Force who headed up a team of experts to investigate the incident in Vietnam which I discussed here on May 18, 1965.

I wish to take this opportunity to report to all Members of this body that the committee was impressed with the thoroughness of the investigation which is being conducted by a team of experienced and highly qualified personnel.

It was apparent from the briefing which we received that they were leaving no stone unturned in their efforts to determine the cause of this most unfortunate incident.

However, as of this moment, final determinations have not been arrived at and the investigation is being continued.

Extensive safety surveys are underway at all of the bases in Vietnam, concentrating on the handling and loading of munitions, to insure that maximum practicable safety precautions are observed.

There were 27 U.S. Air Force personnel killed and 76 injured, 20 U.S. Army personnel injured, and 1 Vietnamese killed; 12 U.S. aircraft were destroyed and 6 damaged. Two aircraft of the Vietnamese Air Force were destroyed, 30 damaged.

There was no evidence which would indicate an overt attack initiated the accident sequence.

There was no evidence that sabotage played a part in this incident. However, it has not been completely ruled out.

The security of the base was and is considered satisfactory.

There was no evidence to indicate that poor maintenance was responsible for the accident.

An engine starter may have caused an accident of this type and is still under suspect.

The delay fuses installed in some of the bombs when the accident occurred may also have caused the accident and remains in the suspect area. A special laboratory type analysis of these fuses is currently underway. In the meantime, the use of such fuses has been suspended.

Under the circumstances, I wish to again reiterate that this is no time for speculation or for any discussion of military matters which could give aid and comfort to our enemy and possibly harm to our military people who are fighting and dying for us in Vietnam.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to concur in the remarks of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] in regard to this investigation. The Defense Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations has listened to a presentation of this matter and I feel that the statement which has been made by the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, is a very fair and important statement.

THE RIGHT REVEREND WILLIAM F. CREIGHTON, EPISCOPAL BISHOP OF THE WASHINGTON DIOCESE

(Mr. REUSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, as an Episcopalian I rise to defend the Right Reverend William F. Creighton, Episcopal Bishop of the Washington diocese, against what was said about him and his May 17 speech last week by two of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], who are both also of the Episcopal faith.

In that speech, Bishop Creighton expressed his opposition to the current rule in the District of Columbia which denies children of an unemployed father the benefits of Federal aid to dependent children payments, although children similarly situated are eligible for such payments in every one of the 50 States of the Union. In making his point, the bishop had something to say about a Member of the other body—some reference or other to bleeding hearts and little children. For this, the bishop was berated for expressing "personal venom," and for departing from the standard of "those who speak from a position in society which clothes them with a high degree of immunity." The bishop was told that "he should keep his nose out of it."

At the risk of sounding like just another organization man, I am for the bishop. I am very proud that he does concern himself with social issues like the care of the children of the unemployed, and that he and his Suffragan Bishop, Paul Moore, Jr., have identified themselves with the forces in this community—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—who are concerned with bringing about better treatment for children who are condemned to poverty through no fault of their own.

Perhaps the bishop's figure of speech was not the most felicitous he could have chosen. But I would point out that when I last looked at the Constitution it was Members of Congress who are given legal immunity for what they say in debate, not bishops.

As far as I am concerned, Bishop Creighton is a gentle and saintly man. We should be glad to hear from him.

BETTER HOUSING FOR MIGRANT WORKERS

(Mr. TODD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing needs of our migrant farmworkers, upon whom the farmers of many of our States depend to harvest their seasonal crops, is better housing. These workers have low incomes, move from locality to locality with the maturing crops, and must depend upon the local housing supplied them in the areas in which they are temporarily employed.

In many States, and particularly in my own State of Michigan, the season is short—lasting at the most 6 to 10 weeks—and the independent farmers themselves are in no financial position to construct housing for labor for their own particular crop. For example, one grower may harvest strawberries, another cherries, another blueberries, another pickles, and another apples. To assist in building housing to meet the need of such an agricultural district, Government help is required. Without it, the consequence is inevitable: The farms will become corporate instead of family, and encompass enough land and enough different crops to make it economically feasible to the corporation to construct such housing.

I believe better housing is urgently needed for our migrant workers. But I also believe the family farm should not

11260

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 26, 1965

be replaced with the corporate farm in order to provide it. This is why we must have Government assistance.

Enabling legislation to provide this assistance was passed last year, and the appropriation before us, I am happy to say, does include a \$2 million provision to further the housing grant program which had previously been authorized. This program is to be run through State and local governments and nonprofit organizations by the Farmers Home Administration.

I do want to note, however, that the Department's original request was for \$5 million. I had hoped that this request would have been granted in full by the committee, in view of the obvious need both to the workers and to the family farms employing them.

I make these remarks today in the hope that when funds for this program are next considered the appropriation will be better balanced with the need.

VICE PRESIDENT SALUTES CHAIRMAN PATMAN

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include a speech delivered by Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it would be impossible to celebrate National Small Business Week without honoring one of our colleagues who I personally feel has done more for small business than any other man in this country. I, of course, refer to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas.

Let me assure you that my view of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] small business achievements is shared by the administration. I think this can be best illustrated by a greeting extended from the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to Chairman PATMAN when the two met yesterday at the Small Business Administration's Small Business Subcontracting Conference here in Washington. I would like to quote the Vice President's greeting:

And here's WRIGHT PATMAN, the man who has done more for small business than any other person in America.

In my short tenure as a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, I have come to wholeheartedly concur in the expression of the Vice President.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, WRIGHT PATMAN is standing up for small business by speaking out against those who would exempt bank mergers from antitrust laws. Of course, we all know that antitrust laws enable the small businessman to compete effectively against large business. Without such laws, small business could not survive.

I am inserting in the RECORD a copy of Chairman PATMAN's speech given yesterday to the Small Business Subcontracting Conference in which he speaks out against exempting bank mergers from antitrust laws. I commend this address to my colleagues:

STATEMENT BY CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN, DEMOCRAT, OF TEXAS, AT THE SBA SMALL BUSINESS SUBCONTRACTING CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, MAY 25, 1965

I am very glad to be here to participate in the SBA Small Business Subcontracting Conference. In my opinion, the 1961 amendment to the Small Business Act providing small business set asides in large Government contracts was a new lease on life to small business. I had the privilege of serving as chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business as well as on the Banking and Currency Committee to which, of course, is referred small business legislation, so I fully realize the importance of small business subcontracts. I am hopeful that small business will enjoy an ever-growing share of Government business.

At the same time, however, small businessmen, as well as everyone else interested in small business problems, must be aware of all other developments that bear upon competition and free enterprise, not just small business alone. My own efforts involve two basic needs of free enterprise: (1) an adequate supply of business credit at reasonable rates of interest; (2) strong antimonopoly laws and vigorous but fair enforcement of such laws.

While I suppose that my views on monetary reform are no secret, I would like to share with you my concern over current moves to weaken the antimonopoly laws.

Monopolies have been like a plague upon mankind throughout our history. Unchecked, they inevitably lead to a police state as individual initiative and freedom of choice fall by the wayside. Also, competitive free enterprise will disappear. The only excuse for permitting a monopoly to exist is where competitive free enterprise would be simply unworkable; the local telephone company, power company, or gas company are obvious examples. Such industries are frequently exempted from the antimonopoly laws as regulated public utilities. Their franchise, territory, quality, and quantity of service and even their charges and profits are subject to constant Government regulation because they are public service utilities. Since there is no element of free competition to spur on such a monopoly to meet public needs, Government must see that these needs are met.

Now the banking industry is definitely not a regulated industry. I am happy to report that at present there is a great spirit of competitive free enterprise among our banks in most communities, although I am disturbed by the fact that we have today exactly one-half the number of banks we had some 30-odd years ago. Banking is not a regulated industry; banking is a supervised industry. The States and the Federal Government share in the chartering of new banks, examination of their loan portfolios; establish merging and branching rules; and supervise banking matters in general, particularly with respect to liquidity and solvency. But banks do not enjoy territorial monopolies like public utilities do, although some would like that, I am sure. They do, however, enjoy a franchise to create money on a 10-to-1 ratio—\$10 in loans for every \$1 in reserves—and this is certainly a tremendous responsibility as well as a privilege. And in this sense banks are truly public utilities. But bankers are not told how much interest they can charge on loans. And bankers are not told what is the maximum profit they can earn. So, although banks enjoy a monopoly, a precious franchise to create money both for the Government as well as for the people of the United States, banking is still a free enterprise industry. I would like to see it stay that way, and I am sure that most people will agree.

This is why I am disturbed by the flurry of activity on the part of big eastern banking interests and their Washington lobby to exempt banking from Justice Department administration of our antimonopoly laws. Banks are already exempt from regulation by the Federal Trade Commission and by the Securities and Exchange Commission. And, as I stated a moment ago, banking is a competitive industry, and not a regulated monopolistic industry. I cannot believe that those who at this very moment are lobbying frantically for this antimonopoly exemption really want banking to be regulated like a public utility. Do these people want fixed prices and fixed profits for banking? Does freedom from vigorous but fair antimonopoly enforcement mean that much to these people? I, for one, would prefer to preserve free enterprise in banking.

I do not believe that the proponents of this legislation have really thought this thing through. Such a drastic exemption from the antitrust laws can only be justified for a fully regulated industry. I certainly oppose this for banking, and I am truly surprised that certain banking interests are pursuing this course. Such a move opens the door for further erosion of our free enterprise system. Now this is not to say that I would close the door to all consideration of improvements of our antimonopoly administration. We must always strive for modernization and efficiency with minimum disturbance to business, while always recognizing that the broad public interest must be served first. As a matter of fact, I would certainly expect the House Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, to look into during the 89th Congress the general question of competition in the banking industry. Not only should we examine merger policy, but also branching, new bank charters, chain banking, interlocking directorates, and possibly other questions.

Our committee has a full schedule at present and these are not matters that you should rush into. Fundamental changes in public policy must be subjected to the utmost scrutiny and careful consideration. We have no emergency in the banking industry, although not everything is, of course, as it should be.

Superconcentration in banking can only hurt the small business which depends upon bank credit to survive. Recently I was informed of a case out west involving a long-established plumbing contractor who lost his line of credit when a holding company took over the local bank. This is not just an isolated case, I assure you.

So, I think all businessmen—whether a banker or a nonbanker, big business or small business—must be informed on serious matters such as this so that through extreme haste drastic changes are not wrought in our free enterprise system for which we all may be sorry.

ANTIDUMPING ACT AMENDMENT

(Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow marks the 44th anniversary of the enactment into law of the U.S. Antidumping Act of 1921. It provides a significant time for me and many of my colleagues to salute the fair and equitable concept of a law designed to deal with the problem of unfair competition from dumped imports without resorting to the use of tariffs or quotas.

In keeping with the moderate tenor of the original act, I have the privilege today of introducing an amendment to

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11387

years, whereas the savings to the Government alone would amount to approximately \$200 million a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The figures which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has stated are extremely impressive. I wish to make sure that I understand how much additional was paid in income taxes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We make an estimate that those who were employed and were previously unemployed received approximately \$80 a week, which is approximately \$26 below the average for manufacturing, or \$4,000 a year, and of that amount \$2,800 would be nontaxable; \$1,200 would be taxable. With a payment of about 16 percent tax rate, \$200 in Federal income tax would be paid per person, not received by the Federal Government previously, and that would amount \$23 million a year for the 116,000 persons.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the amount paid in personal income taxes of \$23 million, added to the savings in unemployment compensation of \$144 million, added to the savings in relief costs—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of \$8 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of \$8 million, totals close to \$200 million a year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Included in that should also be the fact that corporations and employers would be doing business there, and therefore the profits which they might make would be subject to taxation. We estimate that that would be about \$30 million a year. Then there would be State and local taxes, which we have not included.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I point out to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the costs which he was talking about are very largely interest repayable loans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. They were not grants, but primarily loans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These were loans repayable with interest. What is the record of ARA firms in paying back such loans?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall supply that for the RECORD. The losses in the first year were appreciably more than they would have been for bank loans, but the record has steadily improved.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Secretary of Commerce testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency that the record of repayment on loans was most impressive, especially considering the circumstances under which the loans were made, and that he felt, as the Senator from Illinois has said, that the record is improving.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The figures which the Senator from Illinois has placed in the RECORD are eloquent testimony to the fact that this is an excellent investment. It is an investment that is paying for itself over a period of years, and paying for itself rapidly, first, because, as the Senator has pointed out, more taxes are paid; second, because relief and unem-

ployment compensation is less; third, because the loans that are made are very largely being repaid with interest, and are being repaid promptly. That is the kind of information that has not been brought out previously as to the effects of the ARA program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. Now I should like to supply the figures as to the delinquencies as of March 31, 1965. At that time, the loans disbursed amounted to \$96,500,000. Loans foreclosed amounted to \$808,000.

Mr. PROXMIRE. \$808,000 as compared with \$96 million—less than 1 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Loans in foreclosure amounted to \$1,550,000, or total foreclosures of \$3,358,000—approximately 2½ percent.

In addition, \$9 million in loans were delinquent, although only a small part of this amount will result in losses. I think one can safely estimate that the vast majority of the loans, amounting to close to \$100 million, will be paid back. I do not believe that the losses will be appreciable for this type of program.

So on the basis of grants of \$93 million and losses of not more than \$10 million on loans, the total cost to the Government would not greatly exceed \$100 million, and the revenues of the Government should be improved by at least \$200 million a year.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the return is 2 to 1.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not only is the return 2 to 1; the gains are annual gains. The losses are total losses for the 4-year period.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So the ratio is 2 to 1 a year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The gains are really much more than the amount of money expended. The amount of money does not take into account the human part of the program, namely, the restoration of self-respect, the aid to the local communities in preventing them from dying, and the greater utilization of such structures as churches and schools and of telephone services, utility services, and the rest.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is the most impressive feature of all. The very fact that additional people will pay taxes and there will be additional economic development is most encouraging for the country as a whole. These are the areas that are dying, that are extremely sick. These are the areas where the future is almost hopeless.

In addition to the statistical assistance that we can see, there is a very real, human opportunity for people to live in communities they know and love, communities where they are acceptable and have had their family ties; perhaps where their families have lived for generations. This is the kind of human assistance that cannot be measured in statistical terms, but is, nevertheless, immensely important.

When that is added to the monetary return to the Federal Government in a ratio of 2 to 1 a year, the record the ARA has developed is remarkable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it justifies the

existence of the program. I have become a little fed up with the rather captious criticisms that have been made of it. It has been a marvelous human investment and a paying economic investment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. On that very score, is it not true that the arguments that have been made that this is merely borrowing employment from some other area of the country has little validity in the economy in which we are operating?

Most areas of the country are close to full employment. In the Wisconsin area, the heavily populated southeastern part has virtually no real unemployment. On the other hand, in the northern part of the State there is heavy unemployment. The fact that additional jobs can be provided without endangering in a significant way other parts of the country means that this program provides an overall gain in employment. It is not a question of borrowing jobs from one area against another as a matter of unfair or subsidized competition.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before the Senator from Illinois yields the floor, I should like to ask him one or two further questions, because he is the author of the bill.

Is it not true that this is a conservative refinement of the ARA and of the accelerated public works program in a real sense?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. The standards are much stricter than they were in the original accelerated public works program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that fewer counties would probably be able to qualify under the rural criteria. The other criteria were more lenient. Under this stricter, more conservative bill, which requires counties to have an income of less than 40 percent of the national average, fewer counties throughout the country—and I am positive fewer counties in Wisconsin—would be able to qualify.

Mr. DOUGLAS. To qualify, they would have to be areas of need.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that grants must be tied to specific developments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; grants would be made on much stricter terms than under the accelerated public works program.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Accelerated public works were made for a much broader range of purposes. ARA also made grants up to 100 percent. This bill would make grants only up to 80 percent.

The accelerated public works program provided \$450 million a year for 2 years and ARA about \$75 million over 4 years, or \$19 million a year, for a total of about \$470 million if the two were combined. This bill provides \$400 million for public facility grants which is less.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Furthermore, ARA loans authorized by Public Law 87-27—the Area Redevelopment Act—were about \$300 million. While loans under this bill would be \$170 million annually,

they would be interest bearing and fully repayable.

Also, there is a change—the interest rebate factor—which involves overwhelmingly private enterprise money. This provision provides for a modest \$5 million a year investment by the Federal Government, but it will encourage \$250 million of investment funds, and they would be private enterprise funds.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; a 2-percent interest subsidy would make possible the unlocking of \$250 million a year in capital investment. On a 10-year basis, that would be a total investment of \$2.5 billion.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Illinois has performed an outstanding service in this field for many years. He has had to fight his way up the hill many times to have this program enacted.

First, what I like about the bill is that it is national in scope as compared with the Appalachia bill, which was confined to a limited area.

In the second place, it stresses private enterprise and private development. It does not provide for a gigantic federally controlled and directed public works program.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I believe that the overwhelming involvement, the public decisions are made at the local level, the judgment and discipline of the marketplace at the local level, is at work here.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Basic investment decisions will be left up to the private sector of our economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Primarily so. However, of course, there are grants for infrastructure or development facilities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. But the whole purpose of the grants is to create a climate which would be otherwise unattractive to private enterprise, attractive to private enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The purpose is to have the initiative and incentive and the planning come up from the bottom, from the local communities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The opposition on the part of conservative people on the ground that this would interfere with private enterprise and would be some Government activity misses the point. The new jobs would be created by individual American enterprise—much of it corporate enterprise—and would be subject to all the disciplines and all the energizing and initiative factors involved in private individual enterprise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin, who has been one of the most valuable committee members and one of those who helped the most in forming the bill, if some of our best witnesses were bankers.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. In fact, the Secretary of Commerce, who is one of the best known and one of the most highly successful businessmen in the national business community, has had a chance to study the measure carefully and has given it his unqualified support and endorsement.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I want to say briefly that I am very happy that S. 1648 is nearing passage in the Senate. It is a very important bill.

A great deal of credit is due to a number of my colleagues, whom I highly commend. Among others there are the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the senior Senator from Michigan, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works [Mr. McNAMARA], and very particularly, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], who has never ceased to work for and urge this kind of legislation, from which useful projects will put people to work not merely at the site of the project but also in the factory, in transportation, and on the arteries in between.

I am very happy to have been one of the numerous cosponsors of this project, as was my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT]. I point out that for a good many years I have urged the resumption of accelerated public works. I have previously introduced amendments and bills to bring this about.

This is a bill in a somewhat modified form which would not go quite as far as I should like to have it go, in view of the fact that our experience has shown that when the accelerated public works project was before us, the funds originally appropriated and authorized for this purpose, some \$880 million, quickly vanished for worthwhile expenditures, and at the time and subsequent to the expiration of those appropriations, some \$100 million of worthwhile projects, fully matched and ready to go, had to be abandoned. Many of those projects will be resumed now.

I believe that it is particularly gratifying, however, that the bill in its original form has now been amended. The original version of the bill did have an appropriation of \$250 million annually. That amount has now been increased to \$400 million.

I should say that I consider these sums to be not expenditures but investments in the finest sense of the word. Their use would create worthwhile needed projects, and would put people to work.

Much as I applauded the President's war on poverty, I felt then and feel now that it was not sufficiently implemented to do the job of putting the people to work and putting them to work now. Much of the war on poverty has not been a long-range project, then and now, particularly in view of the fact that we are at the height of a prosperity never before equaled in the history of our Nation and that we have continuous unemployment.

I also applauded the fact that the original version of the bill has been changed to include Alaska and Hawaii, which, in the original draft, were omitted because of the fact that they were not areas which were contiguous to the States. That has been changed by amendment.

I was glad to listen to the words of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who has supported this legislation very ably and effectively.

I believe that this is an important step. I believe that this session of Congress will be noted for its fine and rapid

achievements. We have passed bills that will be of tremendous value. There are still many more such measures ahead.

I am confident that this Congress will go down as one of the most productive Congresses in history and that the moves that have been taken are largely and almost wholly in the public interest.

L.B.J. VIETNAM POLICY UNANIMOUSLY SUPPORTED BY ON-THE-SPOT EXPERTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are few more expert among the journalistic fraternity than Thomas B. Ross, correspondent of the Chicago Sun-Times.

Mr. Ross has covered the State Department and been a specialist for the State Department in foreign affairs.

Mr. Ross was sent recently by the Chicago Sun-Times to Vietnam. He has been there since May 1. On last Sunday, May 23, he filed what to me was a very interesting report on Vietnam.

I should like to quote from it briefly. Mr. Ross considers the reaction in Vietnam to our building up of troops and forces and launching air strikes in Vietnam, and states:

Nevertheless, in the virtually unanimous view of officials and observers here, there was no acceptable alternative to the major U.S. buildup which began in February along with launching of airstrikes on North Vietnam.

"The clock stood at 1 minute to midnight," a high-ranking official here observed, and the only other course of action was an abrupt and humiliating withdrawal.

That, in the judgment of every experienced observer this reporter has been able to contact in this area, would have led eventually to complete Communist Chinese domination of southeast Asia.

Mr. Ross is not a man who is ingrained with campaigning for military action. He is dispassionate, and an objective, competent reporter.

Allow me to repeat that last short sentence. It reads:

That, in the judgment of every experienced observer this reporter has been able to contact in this area, would have led eventually to complete Communist Chinese domination of southeast Asia.

Mr. Ross goes on to say:

Critics of President Johnson's Vietnam policy may abound in Washington and elsewhere in the United States, but they are all but impossible to find out here.

A Titoist solution may seem feasible on the American campus, but this reporter has been unable to locate a single resident American—soldier, diplomat, journalist, or scholar—who thought it was a possibility in the current climate of militant expansionism in Peking.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the Chicago Sun-Times of Sunday, May 23, 1965, entitled "United States Courts a Showdown in Vietnam," written by Thomas B. Ross, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11389

UNITED STATES COURTS A SHOWDOWN
IN VIETNAM

(By Thomas B. Ross)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM.—Although the United States has been striving since Korea to prevent the involvement of American soldiers in a war on the Asian mainland, the U.S. establishment here is now seeking just that as a solution to the grim impasse in Vietnam.

High civilian and military officials alike are hoping for a direct confrontation between U.S. combat troops and the Communist Vietcong before the end of June.

The design is to draw the Communists into a "reverse Dienbienphu"—a decisive defeat which will force them to sue for peace. The French, of course, had the same idea in 1954 only to be routed by the Communist-dominated Vietnamh nationalists and compelled to abandon their colonies in Indochina.

But U.S. military men insist there is scant similarity between the French position at Dienbienphu and the American position today.

The French decided to make their stand in North Vietnam at a point at which the Vietnamh commanded the high ground and were operating over relatively short lines of supply.

In South Vietnam today the Vietcong find themselves at the end of a long precarious line of supply which is under heavy bombardment by U.S. planes. And U.S. forces are deployed in the coastal flatlands in terrain favorable to their sophisticated weaponry and with a mighty armada of war and supply ships supporting their rear.

U.S. POSITION AT LOWEST EBB

There are now at least 70,000 U.S. military men in the southeast Asian theater—close to 45,000 in Vietnam and the rest in the surrounding waters and Thailand.

Even so, the U.S. position, in a territorial sense, has never been at a lower ebb. The Vietcong control more of the countryside than ever before and the United States, like France before it, is largely tied down in static defense of key installations and urban centers.

The Government commands so little open ground and covets what it has so jealously that, as one U.S. Air Force general complained: "This is the first war where we've had to rent battlefields."

In these last-ditch circumstances, the strategy of confrontation is as much a counsel of despair as it is of hope. It is in effect an admission that the plan of counterinsurgency, promulgated with such promise by President John F. Kennedy in 1961, has failed and that the war must be won by direct force of U.S. arms.

It also represents a challenge to the original admonition of Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor that it would be foolhardy for the white man to pit himself against the yellow man on Asian soil.

Nevertheless, in the virtually unanimous view of officials and observers here, there was no acceptable alternative to the major U.S. buildup which began in February along with launching of air strikes on North Vietnam. "The clock stood at 1 minute to midnight," a high-ranking official here observed, and the only other course of action was an abrupt and humiliating withdrawal.

That, in the judgment of every experienced observer this reporter has been able to contact in this area, would have led eventually to complete Communist Chinese domination of southeast Asia.

POLICY PLEASES AMERICANS IN VIETNAM

Critics of President Johnson's Vietnam policy may abound in Washington and elsewhere in the United States, but they are all but impossible to find out here.

A Titoist solution may seem feasible on the American campus, but this reporter has been unable to locate a single resident American—

soldier, diplomat, journalist or scholar—who thought it was a possibility in the current climate of militant expansionism in Peiping.

And so, the growing American presence in Vietnam is viewed here with great satisfaction and with a conviction that the United States cannot now be forced out by military means. If there is to be a withdrawal, the belief here is that it will come through the pressure of American public opinion, reacting to frustrating stalemate and mounting casualties.

This view is clearly shared by Peiping which has been predicting openly in party publications that the U.S. Government, prodded by popular discontent and the "bourgeois intellectuals," will abandon Vietnam.

The nagging question is how the Communists will seek to accelerate this "historic inevitability."

Key U.S. military men are speculating that the Vietcong will attack U.S. forces late in June. Several battalions of regular troops have been infiltrated into the central highlands from North Vietnam in the last few months and U.S. intelligence analysts believe they must make a move sometime during the current monsoon seasons.

U.S. bombing raids have seriously damaged Vietcong supply routes and it is felt the Communists must strike decisively with what they now have or withdraw for replenishment. Their capacity for sustained combat on a conventional level is not rated as very good.

This has led many officials, particularly civilians, to doubt that the Vietcong will risk an open showdown. For 20 years they have prosecuted a successful guerrilla war by committing their forces only when they were clearly dominant.

Their central tactic is to overwhelm isolated, undermanned outposts and then to dissolve into the jungle or the rice paddies when superior government strength moves into position.

SELECTIVE KILLERS

They operate under tight discipline and with consummate political calculation. Rape is unheard of among them and, although they resort to terror when all else fails, they are highly selective in their assassination. An ineffectual province or district chief will be spared. An efficient one will be killed. The tax collector, nemesis of the peasant who must often pay both the government and the Vietcong, is likely to be the first to go.

The Vietcong are also masters at the arts of friendly persuasion, when it serves their purpose. During one recent incursion in the central highlands, their first act was to relieve the local women of the chore of sweeping the marketplace. Then, to the delight of the townspeople, who are without radio, television, movies, or any other notable diversion, they provided 2 hours of well-rehearsed entertainment.

Through such a combination of ingratiating and terror, the Vietcong have achieved a high degree of immunity. They move freely throughout most of the country with little fear that the local populace will betray them to the government.

FAILURE OF NATIVE LEADERSHIP

In many areas, when wounded, they boldly resort to hospitals run by the U.S. aid mission, confident that their identity will be concealed. In the last few weeks, they are known to have used Nha Trang, a government-held seashore resort 200 miles northeast of Saigon, as a rest and recreation site for whole companies of guerrillas from nearby units.

The Government's great difficulty in acquiring intelligence on the Vietcong is matched by its inability to respond quickly to what information it does obtain. This represents a failure of leadership, a direct

outgrowth of the calculated efforts of the French to prevent the formation of a native class of commissioned and noncommissioned officers.

The deficiencies of leadership are also reflected in the inadequate performance of the Vietnamese army. The fighting qualities of the Vietnamese foot soldier have often been called into question.

But, in fact, his American advisers are convinced he will perform competently, even bravely, when properly led and, particularly, when he is operating in or near his native locale.

However, the army has yet to demonstrate that it can exercise any enduring control in the countryside beyond the provincial and district capitals. This has led to a decision—at least for the immediate future—to shelve the rural pacification program.

The focus of the war has thus been shifted from counter guerrilla activity to a more traditional form of combat, replete with fire bombs and supersonic aircraft, in short, the United States is seeking to substitute a type of warfare in which it excels for one in which it has proven somewhat amateurish.

It is still much too soon to tell whether sophisticated weapons and conventional ground troops can succeed where counterinsurgency has failed. In fact, there is some evidence of popular resentment to the expanding use of napalm, a development which is not surprising if one has observed a hospital ward full of bleeding women and children seared from head to toe.

BOMBINGS BOOST GOVERNMENT MORALE

But, nevertheless, the massive bombing runs begun in February have had a decisive effect on the morale of the government and the army. Prime Minister Phan Huy Quat, a reserved intellectual normally given to cautious statement, has blossomed into a veritable warhawk.

Even within the Buddhist hierarchy, which had been flirting with neutralism, the bombings have produced a marked swing toward progovernment and pro-American sentiment—a "complete turnaround" in the view of a leading political analyst.

And, particularly in the Mekong River Delta, which comprises the lower third of South Vietnam, there are the first faint signs that the villagers and the peasants are beginning to look upon the government, rather than the Vietcong, as the likely victor.

This, of course, is critically significant amongst a populace which is ideologically neutral, yet relatively well off by Asian standards.

Although 40 percent of its babies die in their first year and the annual per capita income is just a shade over \$100, South Vietnam manages to feed its 15 million citizens better than most of its neighbors feed theirs.

This is a result of the great fertility of the Mekong Delta which is producing 5 million tons of rice—and exporting 300,000 tons of it—each year despite the pronounced disruptions of the war. If peace came to Vietnam, that crop could be doubled, perhaps quadrupled within a year, in the estimation of U.S. economic advisers in the field.

These men, serving with great courage in exposed rural areas, are held in high esteem by the Vietnamese people who, on the whole, show little resentment to the growing American presence in their country.

THE CRITICAL TEST AHEAD

The critical test of whether the new white man is to be accepted as a friend or resented as the colonial successor to the French will likely come in the areas of massive U.S. troop concentrations.

The original Army advisers here were well schooled in the modern doctrines of psychological warfare, even though they sometimes seemed to bark out their lines like a military command: "Win the hearts and

May 26, 1965

11390

minids of the people, and that's an order, sergeant."

On the other hand, the marines and paratroopers recently landed see their mission in old-fashioned terms: "Kill Vietcong."

With little thought for local sensibilities, the marines guarding the Da Nang Airbase openly refer to the primitive village within their lines as "Dogpatch."

When a visiting American asked a guard for the real name of the town, the marine replied with conviction: "It's Dogpatch." Other marines within earshot nodded agreement. It took a call to the command post to produce the correct name, Tong Vu Su, which, as any marine knows, means Dogpatch in Vietnamese.

The adult villagers in and around the marine encampments are conventionally inscrutable and withdrawn, though they have learned to hang out signs which read: "O.K. Laundry. Done Quickly and Carefully."

The children are enthusiastic and vocal. "Hello, Hello," they shout at every passing jeep. "You No. 1. Vietcong No. 10. Give me 5 P's (5 piastres, about a nickel)."

The marines are responding with normal GI generosity—too much so in the view of the local bulldozer operators, who recently conducted a brief strike to protest the fact that the town peddlers were taking in 800 piastres a day, 10 times their own wages. An order by the brigade commander brought the peddlers under control, but the marines have refused to stem the flow of money to the children who have become their tacit allies in a life-and-death friendship.

CHILDREN'S BEHAVIOR OFTEN A TIPOFF

On their regular patrols of the surrounding Communist-controlled territory, the marines are constantly subject to Vietcong ambushes, usually in the small villages.

The adult townspeople can generally be coerced by the Vietcong into silence and a convincing display of normal activity. But the children, whether unconsciously or by design, repeatedly give evidence in their behavior of impending danger. So alerted, several marine patrols have withdrawn or made for cover in time.

At some point in the next few weeks, in the expectation of many high-ranking military men, one of these patrols may make contact with the advance patrol of Vietcong battalion. Then, the great confrontation may be at hand.

But even if this should not materialize, some climax to the Vietnam war seems to be in the offing. Ambassador Taylor and his principal advisers are convinced that North Vietnam is hurting desperately from the relentless U.S. airstrikes. Should the Vietcong call off their expected monsoon offensive, it would only confirm these men in their conviction that the Communists will be forced to the conference table before the end of the year.

If they are wrong in their calculations, if the Vietcong can endure despite the pounding of their supply lines and their staging areas, then the prospect is for a war that will drag on for several more years.

And in that event it will not be decided in the jungles and rice paddies of this pathetically beautiful country. It will be decided in the United States by a rich and comfortable people who must judge the extent of their interest in saving a poor and desperate nation.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON CERTAIN SHIPMENTS INSURED BY THE FOREIGN CREDIT INSURANCE ASSOCIATION AND EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on shipments, to Yugoslavia insured by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association and the Export-Import Bank, for the month of April 1965; to the Committee on Appropriations:

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2634 OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION OF CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON RESEARCH PROGRESS AND PLANS OF THE WEATHER BUREAU

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on research progress and plans of the U.S. Weather Bureau, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XIII: WAR RISK INSURANCE OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Title XIII: War Risk Insurance of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENSION OF PROVISIONS OF TITLE XIII OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, RELATING TO WAR RISK INSURANCE

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the provisions of title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, relating to war risk insurance (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 204 OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 204 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PRACTICAL NURSES' LICENSING ACT

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmit-

ting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Practical Nurses' Licensing Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

CONTRIBUTION BY THE UNITED STATES TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE RED CROSS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize a contribution by the United States to the International Committee of the Red Cross (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN SERVICE BUILDINGS ACT, 1926, TO AUTHORIZE ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, to authorize additional appropriations, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROVISION OF CERTAIN AUTHORITY FOR U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide certain basic authority for the U.S. Information Agency (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for reimbursement of certain moving expenses of employees, and to authorize payment of expenses for storage of household goods and personal effects of employees assigned to isolated duty station within the continental United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary procurement of air passenger service on scheduled commercial airliners from Japan and Korea to the United States, Department of Defense, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loose management in budgeting and financial reporting for certain educational exchange activities, Department of State, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the failure to furnish available parts to a contractor engaged in the production of ¼-ton trucks, Department of the Army dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on inadequate management of special purpose ammunition pallets resulted in unnecessary procurement actions, Department of the Navy, dated May 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improper use of funds appropriated for operation and maintenance

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11415

being the case, it is the responsibility of Congress to protect the public purse, rather than to construct private pipelines from the Public Treasury to private recipients.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hassle Over Patents," which was published on May 26 in the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 26, 1965]

HASSLE OVER PATENTS

The long smoldering dispute over the patenting of discoveries made in the course of federally financed research and development work has flared up again. Senator LEE METCALF, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, accused several high administration officials of "lobbying" on behalf of certain business groups. These groups believe that the patent rights to ideas developed with Federal funds should be awarded to the contracting business firm or nonprofit institution.

"Lobbying" is a pejorative, often imprecise term, and there is little point in attempting to plumb the Senator's charges. But there is much that should be said and done about the failure of the Government to articulate a clear policy in this troublesome area.

Some Federal agencies, notably the Atomic Energy Commission, follow a clear and consistent rule. Except in cases where the research contractor already holds patents in closely related areas, all patents issuing from Federal contracts automatically revert to the Government. But other agencies are permitted by law to waive the patent claims of the Government.

The battle now being waged, both in the Congress and within the administration, is over which policy shall prevail. Senator RUSSELL B. LONG insists that the patents growing out of Federal contracts belong to the public, and he has attached amendments to several important bills which uphold that principle. The patent law bar, industry groups and many universities are ranged on the other side. They contend that the prospect of owning patent rights provides an important incentive to solve problems quickly. And they raise the question of whether the Government has the right to patents where the contracting researcher draws upon a previously acquired expertise.

In October 1963, the late President Kennedy issued a patent memorandum which purported to provide guidance for Government agencies. But that document and the Patent Advisory Panel subsequently formed appear only to have confused matters.

Patent policy issues can be complex, but not so esoteric as spokesmen for the patent bar claim when they chastise laymen for speaking out. When a private business enterprise contracts and pays for research and development work, there is seldom if ever any question about its right to the patents that may emerge. The same principle should apply in the case of Government-sponsored research. There is no good reason why the taxpayers should be expected to pay \$15 billion a year for research and then turn over to the adequately compensated contractors exclusive patent rights.

To be sure, the rights of the owners of "background patents" should be protected when they engage in Government contract work. But aside from that exception, all patents developed under Federal contracts should revert to the Government, and the

Government in turn should make the patented knowledge freely available to all potential users.

SUPPORT OF THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY ON VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently I received a resolution adopted by the 18th District Convention of the American Legion, Department of Texas, in which the actions of our President in defense of freedom and in opposition to Communist tyranny and aggression are fully supported.

I concur in the view of the Legionnaires; and, in order that other Senators may share the view of these dedicated Texans, I ask that a copy of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 4: AFFIRM SUPPORT OF PRESIDENTIAL ACTION IN VIETNAM

Whereas U.S. Advisory Forces are in southeast Asia, especially concentrated in South Vietnam; and

Whereas they are under continual harassment by communist infiltrated forces; and Whereas President Johnson, upon request by the Government of South Vietnam, has taken necessary action in bombing supply lines and troop concentrations in North Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Legion, 18th district, Department of Texas, fully endorses the action taken by President Johnson in response to the request of the South Vietnam Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Office of the President of the United States and with courtesy copies to each U.S. Senator of Texas; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the Department of Texas and the national convention.

Eighteenth district resolution committee,
EARL BASKETT, Chairman.

Members:

JAMES D. O'DANIEL,
W. L. THOMAS.

Date May 2, 1965, action approved.

By vote of the 18th district convention.

Adjutant, the American Legion, Department of Texas.

RECOGNITION OF EASTERN (GREEK) ORTHODOXY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I wish to advise the Members of Congress that the State Legislature of my State of Idaho recently unanimously adopted a resolution to recognize Eastern—Greek—Orthodoxy as a major religious faith in the State. Approximately 30 States have now done so.

Rev. Father Constantine Palassis, of Idaho and eastern Oregon, and members of the Orthodox Church were the moving forces in bringing to the attention of the members of the State legislature the need for such a resolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask that a letter written to Members of the U.S. Congress by the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America, giving some pertinent information

and background on Eastern Greek Orthodoxy, also be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution and the letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 6 BY JUDICIARY AND RULES COMMITTEE

A resolution recognizing the Eastern Orthodox Church as a major faith in the State of Idaho

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Idaho:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the members of the Legislature of the State of Idaho that, whenever mention is made or matter is printed concerning the major faiths, usually, only Protestants, Catholics, and Jews are referred to as constituting the major faiths of the State; and

Whereas the Eastern Orthodox Church, by reason of its long and illustrious history, should be included in the meaning of any recognition of the major faiths: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eastern Orthodox Church is hereby recognized as a major faith in the State of Idaho, and official references to the major faiths shall be deemed to and will include the Eastern Orthodox Church; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit suitable copies of this resolution to the Most Reverend Archbishop Iakovos, Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Church of North and South America, Primate of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese, to the Reverend Father Constantine S. Palassis, of Idaho and eastern Oregon, and to all news media of the State of Idaho.

THE VOICE OF GREEK ORTHODOXY IN AMERICA,
Washington, D.C.

Re the four major religious faiths: Protestant, Catholic, Orthodox, and Jewish.

To the MEMBERS OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JORDAN: In the consideration of two major issues before the U.S. Congress—civil rights and public school prayers—references at the hearings and in debates have been made to only three of the four major faiths, with Orthodoxy, known as the Eastern (Greek) Orthodox faith, being the forgotten faith.

To correct this misconception of only three major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, Jewish—we of the Voice of Greek Orthodoxy in America give you this background information.

1. The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese reveals that there are approximately 7 million Eastern Orthodox in America. Statistics show that there are approximately 7 million 40 million Roman Catholics, and 5¼ million Jews in America. Thus by statistics alone Orthodoxy is one of the four major faiths.

2. Twenty-seven legislatures have passed laws requiring that, in reference to major faiths, Eastern Orthodoxy should be included. Your State may be one.

3. The Armed Forces in 1955 changed their regulations to permit Eastern Orthodox identification in the servicemen's records and their identification (dog) tags. Prior to that time there were only three designations—Protestant, Catholic, Jew.

4. Eastern Orthodox chaplains were permitted for the first time in 1951 although the Eastern Orthodox strived all through World War II for that cherished right.

5. President Eisenhower was the first President to invite an Eastern Orthodox to give a prayer at the 1957 inaugural, thus bringing our four faiths together.

6. Many State and city public functions and inaugurals now have four faiths attending.

11416

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 26, 1965

7. Appointments to high office by Presidents and Governors were being considered only on the three-faiths basis but President Eisenhower and President Kennedy began including Eastern Orthodox for Presidential appointments. More of this is needed.

8. Eastern Orthodox have been erroneously designated as either Catholic or Protestant. History reveals that Eastern Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism separated in A.D. 1054, and Protestants broke away from the Roman Catholic Church in the 16th century. Therefore Eastern Orthodox, Protestants and Roman Catholics are three distinct faiths.

9. Senate and House bills were introduced to refer to Orthodoxy as a major faith.

Thanking you for the privilege of sending you this brief background which we hope you will keep handy and make use thereof, I am,

Respectfully yours,

SAM REVITHES,
National Treasurer, The Voice of Greek
Orthodoxy in America.

OBJECTION TO PROPOSED REVISION OF SKIP-ROW COTTON PLANTING REGULATIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently I received from the Tom Green County, Tex., Crops Committee a letter of protest about the Department of Agriculture proposals to revise skip-row cotton planting regulations.

I share the view of the crops committee that the regulation change is unwise and unwarranted; and in order that other Senators may share the committee's views, I ask that a copy of the letter the committee has sent to the Department of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN ANGELO, TEX.,
May 15, 1965.

DIRECTOR FARMER PROGRAMS DIVISION,
ASCS-USDA
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: We protest the proposed change in the rules for measuring cotton when planted in a skip-row pattern.

Skip-row planting originated in Tom Green County in the 1920's. Some of the land in this area has been planted in skip-rows since it was first put in cultivation.

The proposed change will be a hardship on the producers in this county. It will create much confusion and make it almost impossible for a producer to adequately plan his planting.

The present rule has not increased cotton production in this county, and production figures prove it. Skip-row planting means the difference of whether we make a crop or not.

We request that the proposed change not be made and the present rule be continued in effect. It is necessary to the economy of this area.

Yours truly,

Tom Green County Crops Committee:
W. B. Block, Sonora Route, San Angelo,
Tex.; John Schriever, Jr., Eola, Tex.;
Frank Culley, Route 3, Box 131, San
Angelo, Tex.; J. H. Sims, Route 2,
Miles, Tex.; H. E. Hurst, Route 3, Box
387, San Angelo, Tex.; L. J. Seidel,
Route 2, Miles, Tex.; Walter Fuchs,
Wall, Tex.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY HOLUM DEDICATES JAMES RIVER DAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Sunday, May 23, 1965, the people of the

Huron, S. Dak., area joined in the dedication of an important new dam on the James River, near Huron. This project will provide municipal water, recreation, and wildlife benefits for the people of central South Dakota.

On hand for the major dedication address was one of South Dakota's most distinguished sons, Assistant Secretary of the Interior Kenneth Holum.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent address by Assistant Secretary Holum be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT, AT DEDICATION CEREMONIES OF THE JAMES DIVERSION DAM, HURON, S. DAK., MAY 23, 1965

Three years ago this coming September, I sat down with the mayor of Huron to sign the water-service contract that was necessary before we could begin construction of the James River Diversion Dam.

I had no idea that day that I would have the honor of participating in its dedication. It is an honor; not because of the size of the structure—for it indeed is small compared to Grand Coulee, Hoover, Glen Canyon, or even Oahe Dam—but because of what it represents to people like you and me who have learned the value of water conservation through personal experience here on the drouthy plains.

Most of you present today are products of the James River Valley; so am I. We have seen the "Big Jim" in all its moods, ranging from springtime floods that engulfed our farm lowlands, to the virtual dry, useless stagnation of late summer and fall—and we have despaired.

President Lincoln once commented that "the Almighty has His own program."

Our program here is to put our God-given resources of earth and water to the best possible use for mankind's advancement. This I believe—whether it is in South Dakota or California—is in harmony with the Almighty's plan.

This dam was built at the request of Huron to supplement that city's water supply. And, by the way, we are exploring the possibilities of constructing another dam in the vicinity of Mitchell to meet that city's water needs.

We were happy to respond to the appeal by the mayor of Mitchell and his city council, and the urgent request for swift action by Senator GEORGE McGOVERN. Though this request came to us only a couple of weeks ago, the Bureau of Reclamation already has a reconnaissance study underway, at my direction.

The James River Dam and Reservoir will not only double Huron's water supply, it will provide a great source of recreation for the entire area as well as some mighty fine fishing. Eventually, and I hope soon, this facility will become a feature of the Oahe Unit—that half-million-acre irrigation project, which will mean so much to the economy and welfare of this State.

Five recreation areas will be developed under an agreement with the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks. Two will be here, one on each side of the dam, and the other three along the reservoir at several-mile intervals upstream. Shady picnic areas and boat ramps will provide facilities for lots of fun and relaxation.

Four more areas are being set aside for wildlife habitat along the reservoir. These will be feeding and nesting areas for ducks and pheasants, and feeding areas for deer.

For many people here today, I am sure this is all like a dream come true. The benefits of this development will accrue not only

to us and our children, but our children's children as well.

A community without an ample supply of water is one that is headed for economic stagnation and an end to its growth. I am reminded of a remark made a long time ago by an engineer, advising the city of Los Angeles when it was considering going far back into the mountains for a water supply. The cost was considerable, and there was much hesitation. Finally, the engineer said: "If you don't obtain this water, you won't ever need it."

Well, Los Angeles went after that water, and then more, and more, and you can see the results today.

To grow and prosper, an area must develop its land and water resources. In South Dakota we have come only part way in this job. While we are realizing the great benefits of power generation from Missouri River mainstem dams, in addition to recreation, we can do much more and must, if the economic potential of this area is ever to be attained. I'm talking, of course, about putting the water to work on our productive farmland. I'm talking about the proposed Oahe unit and what it can do to open the doors of economic opportunity in our State, where they have been closed to a narrow slit in the past decade or two.

To get a glimpse of what the Oahe unit can do, let's look at some of the things that have happened in areas similar to this. In 1956, a study was made on the North Platte project in western Nebraska and southeastern Wyoming, which is a 350,000-acre project, first irrigated in 1908. The lands extend over a distance of 110 miles, from Guernsey, Wyo., to Bridgeport, Neb.—an area like the Oahe unit.

In terms of products sold off the farm, the irrigated land on this project produces 13 times more per acre than the adjacent dryland farms. Only 10 percent of the four-county area is irrigated. But that 10 percent is responsible for 91 percent of the total income payments in the area. It supports 27 times as many people, and provides 40 times the income, as adjacent prairie areas of equivalent size.

Property tax revenues in Scottsbluff County, which has irrigation, are 20 times greater than in Banner County, which adjoins it, but has little irrigation. I don't need to remind you, I am sure, what this means in terms of schools, roads, and other civic improvements.

During the drought years of the 1930's, population of the irrigated area increased 18 percent. In the adjacent dryland areas it decreased 12 percent. Similar contrasts can be drawn on project after project throughout the West. It is the story of reclamation.

Past experience with irrigation in eastern South Dakota, and farm management studies of potential irrigation on the Oahe unit, show that the most profitable irrigated land-use pattern would consist primarily of the same crops now being raised in this area, but they would be raised in different proportions.

Likewise, we would raise the same types of livestock we have now. But, instead of shipping them out of the State to be fattened, we would fatten them on our own farms here in South Dakota, and the livestock products would be processed right here in our own State.

What does the Oahe unit mean to South Dakota? Let me give you a capsule idea:

The gross value of crops sold after irrigation development would triple, from \$8 million to \$24 million.

Estimated annual value of livestock and livestock products sold from irrigated farms would nearly quadruple from \$22 million to about \$82 million.

Annual gross farm income would be about \$108 million compared to about \$32 million, without irrigation—an increase of \$76 million, or four times. Cash farm outlay would

May 26, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

11427

without self-righteousness and with a brave freedom from old dogmas.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IN CONNECTICUT

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, 20 years ago this month the fighting in the European theater of World War II came to an end. The end of that terrible war marked the beginning of enormous new responsibilities for the Veterans' Administration. In the State of Connecticut, those responsibilities have been met very well. Through the Hartford office alone, more than \$70 million is disbursed annually to administer veterans programs. The man overseeing the activities of the Veterans' Administration in Connecticut is Col. Edward W. O'Meara. Colonel O'Meara and his staff are charged with care of the records of more than 235,000 Connecticut veterans. The programs that Colonel O'Meara administers vitally affect the lives and well-being of ex-GI's, as well as the lives of their widows and their children. Colonel O'Meara is no stranger to such responsibilities; he was the first manager of the social security office in New Britain.

Furthermore, Ed O'Meara is an old and valued friend. When Governor of Connecticut, it was my privilege to appoint him a member of my military staff. Everything Ed O'Meara does, he does well.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled, "State VA Part of Largest Business Firm in United States," published in the New Britain Herald of May 18, 1965, and describing the fine work of Colonel O'Meara and the Veterans' Administration in Connecticut, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE VA PART OF LARGEST BUSINESS FIRM IN UNITED STATES

(By Arthur E. McEvoy)

Twenty years after VE day and the end of World War II the Veterans' Administration, through its Hartford office, is disbursing more than \$70 million annually in Connecticut to administer many programs for the benefit of men and women who were in the military service in two world wars and their dependent survivors.

In the New Federal Building in the capital city, around which the activities of the VA in Connecticut revolve, many functions affecting the lives of ex-GI's, their widows, and children are carried out by the staff of Col. Edward W. O'Meara, regional manager.

SERVICES LISTED

These include compensation payments, pensions, educational allowances, grants to paraplegic veterans of \$10,000 toward building or buying a home and benefits to widows and minor children. The extent of the transactions may be visualized by the number of checks issued in April. In that month checks went to 42,479 living veterans and 13,973 to widows, widows and children, or children alone. Of the latter figure, 6,582 went to the World War I account and 6,401 to World War II beneficiaries.

In a display case in the main corridor of VA regional headquarters is a newspaper article saying "Today, the biggest business organization in the United States is not General Motors or A.T. & T., but the Veterans' Administration. Veterans and their

immediate families comprise almost half the total U.S. population and the VA has some 22 million 'customers' in its active files."

UNIQUE SYSTEM

The Hartford office has records of 235,000 of the 350,000 veterans in Connecticut. In a forest of steel cabinets are their military history, data on medical examinations and treatments, as well as two-way correspondence. A unique filing system installed as an experiment for possible use throughout the Nation enables members of the staff to find a folder enclosing any veteran's record with a minimum of time and effort.

Specialists fill many posts in the Hartford office. A tour discloses the desks of physicians, lawyers, construction experts, occupation experts, loan administration agents, insurance underwriters, and accountants, a cross section of the professional fields. Other employees vital to the operation are flexo-writer operators, stenographers, dictaphone operators. In addition are many requiring special skills or understanding.

GOOD MORTGAGE RISKS

In the Loan Guarantee Division are approximately 95,000 mortgage loans which the office has guaranteed amounting to about \$1 billion. "Evidence of how our veterans have taken care of their mortgage obligations is indicated by the remarkably low loss ratio which is three-tenths of 1 percent," said Colonel O'Meara, adding, "This, I think anyone would say, is an extraordinary record."

Versatile machines speed the work and make possible swift handling of an enormous amount of business transacted. By means of a telecommunication system about 520 messages are sent out monthly and about 525 received. The office can and does "speak" with all VA installations in the country through a series of relays.

SUPERVISES ESTATES

The mail desk handles about 70,000 pieces of mail a month, 40,000 incoming and 30,000 outgoing. Of those received, about 7,000 are processed by a mechanical locator index that looked to this writer like a small scale ferris wheel. A push of a button brings within reach of the operator's hand the addresses of many thousands of veterans in the State.

Many unanticipated problems are handled by the chief attorney's office which also exercises supervision over estates amounting to \$9 million of some 6,300 incompetent veterans as well as beneficiaries and minor children.

During the fiscal year 1964, \$72,500,000 was expended in Connecticut to carry out various functions of the regional Hartford office. This undertaking was accomplished by a staff of 118 whose working space and appurtenances occupy 30,500 square feet, the entire first floor of the Federal Building.

Colonel O'Meara, who heads this big operation, is no stranger to New Britain. He was the first manager of the social security office in this city.

RETENTION OF SECTION 14(b) OF THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT

Mr. **TOWER**. Mr. President, the Nueces Canyon Chamber of Commerce, headquartered at Camp Wood, Tex., recently endorsed the proposition that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act be retained. I fully share the view of the chamber. In order that other Senators may be advised of how Texans feel on this most important matter, I ask that a letter to me from the chamber president be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NUECES CANYON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Camp Wood, Tex., May 20, 1965.


Hon. JOHN TOWER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TOWER: The Nueces Canyon Chamber of Commerce has endorsed the proposition that section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act should be retained to the end that the right-to-work laws of Texas can be continued.

This action was taken by unanimous vote of the chamber membership at the last regular meeting held May 4, 1965, and the undersigned was instructed to notify you of this action and to request your cooperation in this matter.

Thanking you in advance for a reply at your earliest convenience, I am,

Respectfully,


HORACE KELLY, President.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—XV; AN EX-U.S. OFFICIAL "TURNS STATE'S EVIDENCE"

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, books of great pertinence and value to an understanding of what is going on in Vietnam and in southeast Asia generally are now coming off the presses. Considering the great lack of reliable information about why and to what extent the United States is engaged and the omission of many pertinent facts from official pronouncements, these books are a distinct contribution to public information, and they deserve reading.

Recently, I had printed in the RECORD reviews, from "The Nation," of David Halberstam's book entitled "The Making of a Quagmire," and of Malcolm Browne's book "The New Face of War." Mr. Halberstam was for 3 years the correspondent of the New York Times in Vietnam; and Mr. Browne was there as the correspondent of the Associated Press, and is still there. Both these books revealed tellingly the efforts to suppress the bad news from Vietnam and to give the American people the rosy picture which has, up to date, been part of the official line. Both of these newspaper men were Pulitzer Prize winners, because of the excellence of their reporting of events in Vietnam.

We now have a book written by a Government official, the Public Affairs Officer in South Vietnam—John Mecklin, whose book, entitled "Mission in Torment," has just been issued by Doubleday. In the May 29th issue of "The New Republic," this book is admirably reviewed by I. F. Stone, the knowledgeable editor of "I. F. Stone's Weekly." He entitles his review, appropriately: "An Official Turns State's Evidence." I recommend to all Senators the reading of this review; but even more important is the reading of the book itself. I ask unanimous consent that the review be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OFFICIAL TURNS STATE'S EVIDENCE

(By I. F. Stone)

The most important battle in South Vietnam was the fight to let the American people know what was going on. Two reporters who shared Pulitzer prizes for their part in it, David Halberstam, of the New York Times,

11428

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 26, 1965

and Malcolm W. Browne, of the Associated Press, have recently published their accounts of this battle between bureaucracy and press.

Now in "Mission in Torment," we have the story as seen from the other side. John Mecklin, a Time staff man, took leave of absence to serve as Public Affairs officer of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon from May 1962 to January 1964. The story he has to tell is not peculiar to Saigon. The same struggle goes on in Washington. Covering the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House is a continual rattle between reporters trying to get the news and press officers putting out the Government's party line. If the latter had their way we would all sound like American equivalents of Pravda and Izvestia; too many do. "In Saigon in 1963," Mecklin writes, "the newsmen were regarded as enemies not only by local authorities but also by the American Mission." In this, Washington often seems to differ only in degree from Saigon.

Mecklin charges that the newsmen were rude, self-righteous, and humorless, but he substantially confirms their indictment. Where Halberstam and Browne complain of a constant effort to mislead the press, Mecklin pleads in extenuation that the higher-ups believed their own falsehoods. "The root of the problem," he says, "was the fact that much of what the newsmen took to be lies was exactly what the Mission genuinely believed, and was reporting to Washington. Events were to prove that the Mission itself was unaware of how badly the war was going, operating in a world of illusion. Our feud with the newsmen was an angry symptom of bureaucratic sickness." The defense is more damning than the newsmen's accusations. All governments lie, but disaster lies in wait for countries whose officials smoke the same hashish they give out.

Mecklin lets us see that even this was not the whole story. There were falsehoods the officials believed and falsehoods they told deliberately. "To the best of my knowledge," Mecklin writes, "no responsible U.S. official in Saigon ever told a newsmen a really big falsehood. Instead there were endless little ones." When the newsmen didn't fall for them, Washington complained. "There was a patronizing holier-than-thou tone in the official attitude toward the press," Mecklin relates. "We repeatedly received cables from Washington using expressions like 'tell the correspondents to do so and so or explain how they were wrong' to write such and such. This was like trying to tell a New York taxi driver how to shift gears." This also goes on in Washington where Johnson sometimes seems to think the Constitution made him not only commander-in-chief of the Nation's Armed Forces but editor-in-chief of its newspapers.

In one of his last dispatches as a Time correspondent in Saigon in 1955 after Diem had been in office 9 months, Mecklin quoted an unnamed "prominent American journalist" as saying after his first interview with Diem, "Sort of a screwball, isn't he? His eyes don't even focus." By the time Mecklin got back to Saigon 7 years later, U.S. information policy was designed to make sure that nobody else's eyes focussed properly on Vietnam either. Mecklin's book reveals that the notorious State Department Cable No. 1006, of February 21, 1962, which the Moss subcommittee of the House on Government Information Policies later exposed, was regarded within the bureaucracy as liberalizing press relations. This basic directive was drafted jointly by Arthur Sylvester at Defense and Robert Manning at State; it reflects the animosity to a free press characteristic of both departments. "It was 'liberal,'" Mecklin comments wryly, "in the sense that it recognized the right of American newsmen to cover the war in Vietnam, but it was otherwise little more than codification of the errors the mission was already committing."

Conveniently, the text was classified but the Moss subcommittee was allowed to reveal that newsmen were to be advised against "trifling criticism of the Diem government" and not to be taken along on military activities likely to result in "undesirable stories."

This is not ancient history. The old habits march on. Misinformation is still the hallmark of the Government's information policy. Two examples may be cited, one minor, one major. The minor one concerns the replacement of General Harkins by his deputy, General Westmoreland. Every few months, it would seem, Harkins would issue a statement saying that victory "is just months away"—this was his prediction, Mecklin recalls, the very day Diem was overthrown. His deputy and successor seems to be the same type. But when Westmoreland stepped into his old commander's shoes, the tired Army mimeograph machines ground out the same old tripe. "Like Harkins two years earlier," Mecklin notes, "Westmoreland's press notices described him as a 'no-nonsense' officer."

A major example concerns the State Department's recent white paper. The Mecklin book, like Browne's, rebuts its central thesis. "Like everything else in Vietnam," Mecklin writes, "statistics on infiltrated material and personnel from the North were highly debatable. There was no question that significant Chinese and North Vietnamese supplies had been smuggled. * * * But the vast bulk of Vietcong weapons and equipment were American." Mecklin also has "no doubt that several thousand Vietcong officers and other trained personnel had infiltrated from the North" but he adds that "the overwhelming majority of their forces were recruited locally." The white paper was intended to prepare public opinion for the bombing of the North. Mecklin says that by destruction of factories and training camps in the North "the Vietcong would be weakened, but probably not much more than the efficiency of the Pentagon would be reduced if the air conditioning were shut off." For Mecklin the talk of bombing supply routes "made even less sense" because most of the smuggled supplies were moved on foot or in sampan. In a graphic simile Mecklin writes, "As the French discovered so disastrously at Dienbienphu, air attacks on coolie jungle supply routes is like trying to shoot a mouse hiding in a wheatfield from an airplane with a rifle."

Two hitherto undisclosed scenes stand out in the Mecklin book. One was an interview with Kennedy on April 29, 1963, when the President asked him, "Why are we having so much trouble with the reporters out there?" Mecklin thought there would be less trouble if officials were more candid. He wanted Kennedy to put a stop to "excessively optimistic public statements" in Washington and Saigon and the habit of "complaining" to editors and publishers "about unfavorable stories" from reporters in the field. Mecklin says he found Kennedy "skeptical but willing to try."

One wonders whether Mecklin was not naive. We know from Halberstam's book that Kennedy himself tried to persuade the publisher of the New York Times to transfer him out of Saigon. Six months later Kennedy was to issue the biggest optimistic whopper of the war—the McNamara-Taylor statement at the White House, October 2, 1963, that all was going so well in Vietnam we could withdraw 1,000 men by the end of the year and complete "the major part of the U.S. military task" by the end of 1965. The desire to primp up the face of truth was not confined to the lower echelons. Mecklin forgets to mention that speech by Carl Rowan, now again in charge of Vietnamese "information," about the public's "right not to know" which the Moss subcommittee protested. Nor the way this echoed Kennedy's speech to the publishers after the Bay of

Pigs on the need for greater "restraint" in covering undeclared wars.

Another White House scene on which Mecklin lifts the curtain for the first time was a special meeting of the National Security Council on September 10, 1963, when the Buddhist crisis was about to bring down Diem. The Bay of Pigs made Kennedy aware of how wrong the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA could be. Had he lived longer, he might soon have come to feel the same way about their advice on Vietnam. Mecklin was invited to be present to hear a report from a special two-man mission Kennedy had hurriedly sent out to Saigon for a fresh look at the state of the war and of popular support for Diem. The mission was composed, Mecklin relates, of a Pentagon general and a senior Foreign Service officer, "both relatively unknown, though experienced Vietnam hands." Each reported separately. Their reports turned out to be so different that when they finished, President Kennedy asked, with that dry wit which made him so winning, "Were you two gentlemen in the same country?"

Mecklin writes that security regulations prohibit him from reporting anything further about the meeting. He does say that while every other agency thought the time had come to reform, or get rid of, the Diem regime, "the Pentagon, unpersuaded that the war had been affected by the Buddhist upheaval, continued to agitate for no real action at all," while the CIA "was more or less of the same opinion." This should be read with Halberstam's and Browne's accounts of how stubbornly deaf General Harkins and the top CIA man in Saigon, Richardson, remained until the very end when their junior officers in the field tried to tell them what was going on. The lack of congressional or popular control over these huge military and intelligence bureaucracies allows them to go on being wrong with impunity. Each "mistake" leads on to a bigger one.

Yet Mecklin would drag us further into the Asian morass. He advocates the use of combat troops to take over the war in South Vietnam, he believes the national interest requires it and he thinks the war can be won in no other way, though it may take many years and many men. At one point he talks of the need for an army of 1 million men. I wonder how he reconciles this with his observation that we have been losing because we have not won the peasant over to our side. The peasant, Mecklin says, in the most perceptive passage in his book, is aware "if only intuitively" that the United States is in Vietnam for "global strategic considerations, not because of sympathy for the Vietnamese people." To step up the bombings north and south as we have been doing, and to follow this with combat troops as we have begun to do, means to burn up much of Vietnam for those global strategic considerations. This is unlikely to endear us to the least intuitive peasant in Vietnam or anywhere else.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, during the period May 23-30, churches of all denominations throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week. This annual observance is sponsored by the Nation's 3,000 local Soil and Water Conservation Districts. "Challenge of Growth" is the theme of this year's Soil Stewardship Week observance.

In the great society of mankind, each of us has a God-given purpose for being. In our time, each among us fulfills a mission on the long progression toward the ultimate design of our Maker.

May 26, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/11/04 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300190016-2

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2675

the individual worker who would maintain his freedom of choice enjoys a marked advantage.

Anchorage Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 20, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on the recent anniversary of the great Alaska earthquake, Alaskans looked back to survey their progress of recovery from the devastation of March 27. In looking back at that year, they were proud of what had been accomplished. In special editions of newspapers, prominent citizens reviewed the work of the year and praised their fellow Alaskans.

Progress since the earthquake in Anchorage, the State's largest city and one that suffered vast destruction, is now the subject of a survey by a national columnist. This writer, Richard Starnes, finds, as Alaskans do, that this year has been one of great progress. His column, "Anchorage Reborn," printed in the Washington Daily News on May 24 follows:

ANCHORAGE REBORN
(By Richard Starnes)

ANCHORAGE.—The story of Anchorage is the story of a city that refused to die.

Thirteen months ago the worst earthquake ever recorded in North America crushed Anchorage and half a dozen surrounding communities. Seismic sea waves completed the destruction. When they had subsided, 115 Alaskans were dead and property damage was counted in the hundreds of millions of dollars.

A hideous, gaping wound ran through the heart of Anchorage. Much of the Fourth Avenue business district collapsed into it; elsewhere homes and apartments were literally shaken to pieces as the very earth beneath them coiled and heaved as if some subterranean monster were in its death agonies. In Turnagain Heights, Anchorage's most fashionable residential neighborhood, homes were sucked into the ground and crushed by the earth's convulsions.

Loss of life was unbelievably low in view of the awesome destruction wrought by the tremor, but families saw the work of a lifetime wiped out in seconds—uninsured and irreplaceable.

The most remarkable thing about the giant earthquake was the fact that human beings faced what must have seemed to be the end of the world with superhuman courage. Tales of heroism and sacrifice are commonplace, and accounts of hysteria are notably sparse.

In the epochal year that has passed since the earthquake, Anchorage has performed a miracle of rebuilding a city on the very earth that betrayed it. Today one could spend days in Anchorage and see no obvious scars of the cataclysm that beset the city.

Anchorage looks more like a boomtown than the shattered relic of earthquake. New construction is going on as if the rich oil deposits beneath Cook Inlet are the only future surprises that the earth holds in store for Anchorage. Damaged buildings have been repaired and the wreckage of destroyed structures has been bulldozed away. The J. C. Fenney building that was nearly shaken to pieces last March has been razed, and a new

steel-reinforced concrete structure has replaced it. The Anchorage Westward, a new 450-room skyscraper hotel that many a larger city might envy, was damaged by the tremor but is now in full operation. The Captain Cook, another high-rise hotel, is nearing completion. A new hotel is also being planned at international airport and Sears Roebuck has confirmed plans for a new shopping center as grandiose as any in what Alaskans call "the lower 48." School enrollment at 19,100 is higher than it was when the quake struck, and Anchorage is feverishly planning new school buildings to meet the need. The city's population has grown an estimated 13 percent in the last 3 years—and, earthquake or no, it is still growing.

Support of the President's Policy on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of a resolution adopted on April 26, 1965, by the Niagara Falls City Council, in support of the President's policy on Vietnam, together with a petition, with 1,561 signatures, initiated by the members of the Zeta Beta Tau Fraternity, at Queens College of the City University of New York, also in support of our present policy on Vietnam.

There being no objection, the resolution and the petition were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A MEETING OF THE NIAGARA FALLS CITY COUNCIL, HELD APRIL 26, 1965

Whereas North Vietnam Communists, without provocation, have infiltrated and invaded South Vietnam with military force; and

Whereas the United States has committed itself to defend the self-determination of South Vietnam against the North Vietnam attack; and

Whereas the President of the United States has firmly held to this policy, and has taken appropriate military action to defend the right of South Vietnam to govern itself according to its own national interests; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city council of the city of Niagara Falls does hereby commend our President for his steadfast purpose to defend South Vietnam while maintaining a policy of unconditional discussion on peace; and this city council further resolves to urge our Congressmen and U.S. Senators to stand by the President with unwavering support until a successful conclusion of the conflict is achieved, and be it further

Resolved, That the mayor of the city of Niagara Falls be directed to send this resolution to the President, our Congressmen, and U.S. Senators.

E. DENT LACKEY,
Mayor.

Attest:

HELENE M. BREED,
Acting Deputy City Clerk.

We, the undersigned, support our present policy in Vietnam. We feel that this policy is in line with the U.S. tradition of supporting freedom throughout the world.

Accomplishments of the Johnson Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD FULTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, in editorials which recently appeared in the Nashville Tennessean, President Johnson is commended for his actions in the Dominican Republic and record of accomplishment over the first 100 days of this administration since the inauguration January 20, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to place these editorials in the RECORD and commend them to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, May 3, 1965]

PRESIDENT'S FIRST 100 DAYS EVENT FILLED, PRODUCTIVE

President Johnson has just completed 100 days in office since his January 20 inaugural oath. It has been a busy time, marked by fast-paced activity on the domestic front and days of tension on the international scene.

The war in South Vietnam has occupied much of the President's time and concern. And if that were not enough, at the end of the first 100 days he was also concerned with a revolt in the Dominican Republic.

Despite the clouds of omen, there were a good many bright signs for which the President could feel pleased. The Nation's economy has been booming. Some threatening strikes have been averted, or in the case of steel, at least delayed.

Furthermore, the President should be highly gratified thus far with the first session of the 89th Congress. With successful passage of the sweeping education bill, the aid to Appalachia program, House passage of medical care and social security legislation, and the expected enactment of a voting rights measure, it can be said that Congress is both busy and productive.

In comparison with the first 100 days of President Roosevelt, there are fewer bills and Congress is not booming them through at the same hectic pace. But the 73d Congress had an altogether different economy to deal with; there was less time for debate and study in 1933.

President Johnson was swept into office on a tidal wave of votes. Few, if any Chief Executives have had a larger mandate in terms of ballots. But the President is too wise a political leader to attempt to move mountains suddenly.

Mr. Johnson has retained a friendly and constructive relationship with Congress. Minority opposition is there, but it has been generally more constructive than blindly obstructive.

The President's program is moving ahead at a steady pace, and he has every right to look back on the 100 days with great satisfaction, insofar as domestic problems are concerned.

The war in Vietnam has been his greatest headache, but at the same time extension of that fight and the President's Baltimore speech has begun to change the world's image of him from something of an unknown quantity to one of a Chief Executive with stature, toughness and shrewdness. In short, even with those who disagree with him elsewhere in the world, President Johnson has won grudging respect.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 26, 1965

A2676

No one can predict with any certainty what the next 100 days in office will bring for the President. It is safe to bet they will be filled with great activity and great events and that the world will have even a stronger picture of the President who is firmly in the saddle, and riding his own horse.

[From the Nashville Tennessean,
Apr. 30, 1965]

PRESIDENT MOVES TO BAR ANY CUBAN-LIKE TAKEOVER

The dispatch of U.S. Marines into the Dominican Republic was bound to have repercussions in Latin America and elsewhere, but President Johnson obviously felt that there was a greater risk there than any critical reaction.

The Marines went in to give protection to American citizens, but they were subsequently fired on and they fired back. Behind their presence may be the very strong fear that Castro Communists were interested in the Dominican uprising.

President Johnson has made it plain enough that he doesn't intend to have another Cuba in the Caribbean, even if he must risk raising the old specter of U.S. imperialism in Latin America.

Reports from Washington indicate that the administration is concerned with accumulating evidence that the Dominican revolt has gone beyond the normal experience of such revolutions; that several cease-fires have been pledged and broken; and that people have been stood against the wall and executed to cries of "paredon," which means, "to the wall," and was a familiar noise of the Castro takeover in Cuba.

The coup that was attempted nearly a week ago was not so much a matter of issues as an effort by the supporters of ex-President Juan Bosch to restore him to power. The loyalist forces have claimed that Bosch is supported in his bid to regain power by the Communists. The pro-Bosch forces deny this.

But it has become quite apparent that the Communists are looking for a chance to play a role from the sidelines.

At first, the United States apparently decided to remain officially neutral. Its main efforts were to seek a cease-fire, and those efforts had appeared to be a success. But renewed fighting broke out.

At this point, President Johnson announced that he would send in the Marines to protect American citizens. He said he acted after being informed by Dominican military authorities that the lives of these citizens were in danger.

The presence of the Marines and U.S. warships off the Dominican Republic will have a large message to the hemisphere. Undoubtedly it will disturb deeply a good many in Latin America. But it will leave no doubt that the Nation will act when the lives of American citizens are threatened.

The Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 26, 1965

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, taking note of President's Johnson's recent request for \$700 million to finance American efforts in Vietnam, the Dallas Morning News pointed out that the defense of freedom is never cheap, either in lives or in dollars.

In a May 6 editorial, the News goes ahead to spell out the indisputable logic

behind the policies President Johnson is pursuing in that embattled southeast Asian nation. The editorial follows:

THE COST

President Johnson's request for \$700 million to finance the free world effort in Vietnam was not the first bill to come due for that bloody conflict. It probably will not be the last. Though we often seem to take it for granted, freedom does not come cheap.

It must be won, often at great sacrifice, and it must then be constantly defended against those who would destroy it. The cost, in lives and treasure, is unavoidable if we mean to be free.

We learned long ago that we cannot buy our freedom in the counterfeit coin of appeasement. When we try to trade others' freedom to save our own, we pollute our honor along with our liberty. The loss of freedom by one people diminishes the freedom of all people.

That is why we have assumed the responsibility for helping those nations that are threatened by Communist enslavement. We did not ask for it. But we have it. We have it because no one else in the free world is strong enough to do the job.

This does not mean that we can defend the entire free world alone. Our power and resources are not infinite. But we can and must conceive every nation willing to defend its own independence from Communist imperialists that we will come to its aid if it is attacked.

Furthermore, we must show that we will keep the faith when the going is hard, when the war drags on or when fortune turns against us.

Brave words and firm promises are not enough. They must be backed up by deeds. If we extend our support to an embattled nation, then withdraw it later because the task has become too burdensome, we will not be asked for help again. An ally that abandons its friends in the midst of a conflict when its help is needed most, is worse than an enemy.

The aim of the Communists in Vietnam encompasses much more than the conquest of the southern half of the country. Their goal is to show that the promise of the American Nation to stand firm with a free people is worthless, that communism is irresistible. They want to show every small or weak nation in the world that it is suicidal to fight in defense of its freedom and that an American commitment to that defense will dissolve into a betrayal when the American public tires of it.

If we back out of Vietnam, the Communists' point is made. Thousands of South Vietnamese soldiers and hundreds of Americans will have died for nothing. The destruction and misery suffered by South Vietnam will have been suffered for nothing.

The Communists have told us that they intend to prove in South Vietnam that the inevitable result of a "liberation war" is a Communist triumph and that surrender is therefore the wisest course for any nation coveted by the Communists.

The cost of proving them wrong is going to be heavy, but we must pay it, for it is the cost of freedom for ourselves and for our children.

Two Constructive Statements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend

my remarks I include therein two very well written and timely editorials touching upon the critical international situation, one entitled, "The Other Vietnam Story" from a recent edition of the Boston, Mass., Globe, and the other one entitled, "No More Cubas" from a recent edition of the New Bedford, Mass., Standard-Times.

These editorials make a real contribution to the discussion of the grave Vietnam and Santo Domingo problems—the first one calling for strength, calmness, and firmness, and the second pinpointing the constructive, humane phases of current developments in Vietnam and the Far East.

I think both of these writings are worthy of careful reading by Members of Congress and the American people.

The articles follow:

[From the Boston Globe, May 14, 1965]

THE OTHER VIETNAM STORY

An inconspicuous press dispatch from South Vietnam recently described the arrival of thousands of native men, women, and children at Salgon, and at a U.S. base area further north on that country's coast. They were terrorized fugitives from inland villages sacked by the Communist Vietcong, who had murdered their local chieftains.

To this tragic human side of the current war, and to the hitherto little publicized story of the help our own nation has been giving the Vietnamese during the past decade, President Johnson addressed himself in his speech Thursday. Seldom has a report so cogent been offered to the American public at a more appropriate moment.

Hitherto during this war the only dramatization of our country's peaceful reconstruction efforts in South Vietnam was the President's disclosure a fortnight ago of his postwar billion-dollar assistance program. That scheme, as he noted yesterday, is already moving ahead.

But the main burden of President Johnson's accounting Thursday was of work in progress, work begun long before present hostilities were unleashed by Hanoi, work that is continuing despite raid, battle, and terror. It is the story of the \$2 billion in American aid which began in 1954 and continues the modernization of Vietnamese agriculture, the building of schools, health centers, hospitals and industries, and the training of administrators. His report was a warm and well-deserved tribute to the courageous civilians, Americans and Vietnamese alike, who are carrying that work forward.

[From the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, May 3, 1965]

NO MORE CUBAS

The President of the United States, in ordering U.S. fighting men into the frontlines of the Dominican Republic uprising "to help prevent another Communist state in the Western Hemisphere," deserves the fullest support of the American people.

Mr. Johnson's evaluation of the Dominican situation is based upon constantly emerging evidence that, whatever the revolution was when it began, other and sinister forces soon seized control of it. The former U.S. ambassador to Santo Domingo, John Bartlow Martin, commented that he was "convinced" the uprising had been completely taken over by Castro-dominated Communists. Mr. Martin said the insurgency had started as a "genuine revolution to restore exiled former President Juan D. Bosch to power," but added, "Bosch would be heartbroken to see the results now."

It also is evident that the United States delayed its military intervention to the last possible minute when such action could have